



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

909 WRIT PETITION NO. 4949 OF 2023

RAJIV GANPAT MAYEKAR
VERSUS
MORSING SEVA CHAVAN AND OTHERS

...
Mr. Bharat S. Doifode – Advocate for Petitioner
Mr. V.B. Patil – Advocate for Respondent Nos.4 and 5
...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
DATE : 09.12.2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5.
2. The petitioner challenges the order 03.02.2023 passed by the learned C.J.J.D., Soyagaon, in R.C.S. No.2/2013, below Exhibit 70, whereby the application filed by the plaintiff/petitioner for amendment in plaint under Order VI Rule 17 and for addition of party under Order I Rule 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, came to be rejected.
3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that, the learned Trial Court, while considering the said application, rejected it on the ground that there were no specific pleadings in the proposed amendment application and it was vague. He also submits that the proceedings before

the learned Trial Court are at the stage of evidence.

4. After going through the impugned order passed by the learned Trial Court, I do not find any reason to interfere with the order dated 03.02.2023 passed by the learned C.J.J.D., Soyagaon, in R.C.S. No.2/2013 under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. In view thereof, the petition stands dismissed. No order as to costs.

6. However, as the petitioner/plaintiff is at liberty to file a fresh application before the learned Trial Court by incorporating specific pleadings and narrating the relevant facts. The learned Trial Court shall decide such application on its own merits and without being influenced by the order passed by this Court.

[SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE]
JUDGE